UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,817	03/29/2004	Avaneesh Dubey	11884/414001	9999
23838 KENYON & K	7590 09/25/200 ENYON LLP	EXAMINER		
1500 K STREE		ROSEN, ELIZABETH H		
SUITE 700 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20005	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3692	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/810,817	DUBEY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
ELIZABETH ROSEN	3692	

	EEIE/IBETTT NOOEN	0002
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 09 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or the statutory period for reply expire I	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 (Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orige than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee jinally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially re	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected ciaims.
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-8,13,15-26 and 28. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ili be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
	/Nga B. Nguyen/	
	Primary Examiner, Art L	Jnit 3692

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant first argues that Kochansky does not disclose "providing a first data structure object representing a receivable, the receivable being unlinked to a second data structure object representing a collateral agreement." However, there are multiple ways to "link" a receivable to a collateral agreement. Therefore, a receivable is "unlinked" when one of the methods of linking has not yet occurred. As explained in the most recent office action, Paragraphs 0048-0049 of Kochansky disclose that collateral held as credit is available for further credit support, but is unlinked until it becomes collateral pledged, which means it is turned over to cover the exposure. At the point it becomes pledged collateral, it is linked. Unless Applicant uses language in the claims that makes it clear what is meant by unlinked and linked, the terms must be interpreted in a broad but reasonable manner.

Applicant next argues that Kochansky does not disclose "applying criteria specified in a global declaration of purpose to the receivable for determining whether to link the receivable to the collateral agreement." As explained in the most recent office action, Kochansky uses criteria to determine whether to transfer collateral from collateral held as credit (i.e., "available for further credit support") to collateral pledged (i.e., "collateral already turned over").

Applicant next argues that Kochansky does not disclose "direct link." As explained with regard to Applicant's first argument, there are many ways to create a direct link and one way would be change collateral from collateral held as credit to collateral pledged. Because the specification and claims of the instant application do not specify what is meant by "direct link," the term must be interpreted to mean any type of direct link.

/Nga B. Nguyen/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3692